Philosophy Now **Philosophy Now Forum**
For the discussion of all things philosophical, especially articles in the magazine Philosophy Now.

Search…

Philosophy Now a magazine of ideas

GOD ISSUE
WHAT NIETZSCHE DID TO DALI

Quick links FAQ Register Login

Philosophy Now magazine ‹ **Board index** ‹ **Philosophical Discussion** ‹ **General Philosophical Discussion**

Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply Search this topic… 731 posts 1 … 37 38 **39** 40 41 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 9:43 pm
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 4:28 am
> > > 1. you are, again, just saying and writing things that are already known.
> > >
> > > 2. The Universe could never have begun nor created all at once. So, saying that the Universe 'may have been created' is just False, and Wrong.
> >
> > The universe certainly could have been created.
>
> The 'Universe', by definition, has to be and is infinite and eternal, and therefore was not 'created', in the sense if all at once by something else.
>
> The infinite Universe is in an eternal Creation.

So by that premise creator would be *in* creation? Or part of creation? If creator is within creation or part of creation would that really be creator?

By your premise the universe, or all that is, infinite and eternal, would be *within* an eternal creation?

That is precisely the complexity and confusion arising from the restrictive term “universe”.

It also allows conception of “internal creator” in which creator of the universe resides within the universe itself. Such philosophies encourage solipsistic, ego-driven desires and personalities, wherein personal consciousness is creator and ultimate arbiter, not a superior intelligence or power beyond the universe.

Existence allows for creator beyond creation. Existence allows for a creator beyond the universe. However the term existence accommodates and interchanges with the term and concept universe and all it signifies as well.

Existence is the most comprehensive concept and term, not universe. Existence is also the most comprehensible and most practical concept and term.

With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a pineapple, or any other item, and easily declare existence. However one could not point to a pineapple and easily declare universe.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 9:43 pm
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> > Universe is a restrictive, limited term and as illustrated serves largely to deny a higher power.
>
> If this is what you want to believe is true, then okay, but please inform 'the readers', here, how you are defining the 'Universe' word, and, what could possibly have a higher power than 'That'.

The universe is simply a system. Similar to a video game universe or a computer simulation. A creator could exist beyond the system as a creator exists beyond the video game console or the computer. Existence allows and encompasses such an arrangement. The limited term universe, as you illustrate, does not.

Further the scientific community estimates the age of the universe at approximately 13.79 billion years. Existence carries no such scientific figure or limitation.

Last edited by daniel j lavender on Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am, edited 1 time in total.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 9:43 pm
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Apr 10, 2025 1:17 pm
> > >
> > > The universe certainly could have been created.
> >
> > The 'Universe', by definition, has to be and is infinite and eternal, and therefore was not 'created', in the sense if all at once by something else.
> >
> > The infinite Universe is in an eternal Creation.
>
> So by that premise creator would be *in* creation? Or part of creation?

Yes. The Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self, which is always 'in' a constantly evolving creation.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> By your premise the universe, or all that is, infinite and eternal, would be *within* an eternal creation?

Not necessarily so. By 'my, so-called, premise' the Universe, Itself, is the very 'Thing', Itself, which is, and/or within, an eternal Creation, if Its own Self. Or, in other words the Universe, Itself, is creating, Its Self, eternally, HERE-NOW.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> That is precisely the complexity and confusion arising from the restrictive term “universe”.

But, what 'complexity' and/or 'confusion' are 'you' having and/or 'seeing', here, exactly?

There is absolutely nothing complex, nor confusion, here, at all. Well not to 'me' anyway.

Through evolution the Universe is being Created, or is 'with and in', (with-in), Creation, Itself, creating It Self, always, and in always.

Which fits in perfectly with the One that is, or was, coming to know they Self. Once you human beings also know, 'the answer to), 'Who am 'I'?' then all-of-this makes far more sense.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> It also allows conception of “internal creator” in which creator of the universe resides within the universe itself.

Not necessarily so, because the Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Such philosophies encourage solipsistic, ego-driven desires and personalities, wherein personal consciousness is creator and ultimate arbiter, not a superior intelligence or power beyond the universe.

When 'you', also, learn and understand how and why 'you', an individual human being, does 'this', then more about who and what 'you' are, and who and what 'I', exactly, will, also, be learned and understood.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Existence allows for creator beyond creation. Existence allows for a creator beyond the universe. However the term existence accommodates and interchanges with the term and concept universe and all it signifies as well.

Okay, if 'you' really want to believe that there is some thing beyond or outside of the Universe: Everything: All-there-is, then okay, but 'we' can see the blatant contradiction of yours, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Existence is the most comprehensive concept and term, not universe. Existence is also the most comprehensible and most practical term and concept.

It is also blatantly obvious that 'this' what 'you' 'currently' believe is absolutely true, and that you are 'trying' your hardest to get others to accept and believe is absolutely true as well.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a pineapple, or any other item, and easily declare existence. However one could not point to a pineapple and easily declare universe.

If this is, really, what you want to believe, and say is true, then okay.

But are you absolutely sure that one could not point to a pineapple, and then inform another, 'Therefore, nor declare, Universe?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
>
> The universe is simply a system.

If you say so, and an infinite and eternal one let 'us' not forget.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Similar to a video game universe or a computer simulation.

If really, then why, exactly?

A creator could exist beyond the system as a creator exists beyond the video game console or the computer. [/quote]

No it could not. As explained to you, previously.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Existence allows and encompasses such an arrangement.

There has been and is some thing so blatantly obvious, here, which defeats, and/or refutes, you belief and claim, here, but you sadly just keep missing 'it'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> The limited term universe, as you illustrate, does not.

But I have actually shown, and illustrated, the exact opposite of what you believe I have. So, why do you think this is so?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Further the scientific community estimates the age of the universe at approximately 13.79 billion years.

If any group of you human beings 'estimate', presume, guess, or believe any thing, then does that in and if itself make 'it' True, Right, Accurate, and/or Correct?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Existence carries no such scientific figure or limitation.

It would if you were a bit more open to looking at and seeing things, besides your own already obtained and 'currently' held onto beliefs and presumptions, here

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > So by that premise creator would be *in* creation? Or part of creation?
>
> Yes. The Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self

The creator of the universe is the universe? That is circular.

Besides aren’t you claiming the universe to be eternal? So it wouldn’t be created by your terms anyway.

By articulating existence as infinite and eternal creation is not an issue nor is universal terminology.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > By your premise the universe, or all that is, infinite and eternal, would be *within* an eternal creation?
>
> Not necessarily so. **By 'my, so-called, premise' the Universe, Itself, is the very 'Thing', Itself, which is, and/or within, an eternal Creation**, if Its own Self. Or, in other words the Universe, Itself, is creating, Its Self, eternally, HERE-NOW.

So that would be a **yes**.

You’re claiming the universe to be infinite and eternal, all of everything, but it isn’t the future, yet. Or any of the other stuff yet created. It isn’t comprehensive.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > It also allows conception of “internal creator” in which creator of the universe resides within the universe itself.
>
> Not necessarily so, because the Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self

And that’s circular.

Something that is would not need create itself.

A does not create A. A is A.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a pineapple, or any other item, and easily declare existence. However one could not point to a pineapple and easily declare universe.
>
> If this is, really, what you want to believe, and say is true, then okay.
>
> But are you absolutely sure that one could not point to a pineapple, and then inform another, 'Therefore, nor declare, Universe?

You define universe as “all-there-is”. A pineapple is not “all-there-is”.

Pointing to a pineapple claiming it’s “all-there-is” is inaccurate. Pointing to a pineapple claiming it’s “that which is perceived” is accurate.

Existence is the more comprehensive, more practical concept and term.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:41 pm
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:35 am
> > Once you know that unicorns don’t exist…
>
> Then to what are you referring?

Direct experience.

Which points to that there isn’t anything beyond direct, immediate (so called) experience.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:28 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:41 pm
> >
> > > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 8:35 am
> > > Once you know that unicorns don’t exist…
> >
> > Then to what are you referring?
>
> Direct experience.

A unicorn is direct experience?

So you refute your own claim?

> **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
> Which points to that there isn’t anything beyond direct, immediate (so called) experience.

That is blatant limitation, and you somewhat acknowledge that with your own statement.

Existence is not confined to conscious or perceptive experience; that is only part of existence.

What you refer to is existence, a part of existence if only conceptual. You already affirmed the unicorn by simply referencing it.

You cannot definitively claim that unicorns do not materially exist. To do so you would have to be omniscient or omnipresent, and you don’t even know what’s going on next door.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 1:01 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > > So by that premise creator would be *in* creation? Or part of creation?
> >
> > Yes. The Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self
>
> The creator of the universe is the universe? That is circular.

Not when, and if, 'that' is combined with what else I have said and written, here, and with what I actually meant and not with what you are just assuming I am meaning.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> Besides aren’t you claiming the universe to be eternal?

No.

And, before you go and make more Wrong assumptions, here, think about what 'your question' is actually asking, here.

So it wouldn’t be created by your terms anyway.[/quote]

But, It is created, exactly, in 'the terms', which I have said, used, and meant, here.

Are you absolutely sure that you even know, exactly, what 'my terms' are, yet?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> By articulating existence as infinite and eternal creation is not an issue nor is universal terminology.

If this is what you want to believe is true, here, then okay.

But, are your interpretations and assumptions always Correct and Accurate?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > > By your premise the universe, or all that is, infinite and eternal, would be *within* an eternal creation?
> >
> > Not necessarily so. **By 'my, so-called, premise' the Universe, Itself, is the very 'Thing', Itself, which is, and/or within, an eternal Creation**, if Its own Self. Or, in other words the Universe, Itself, is creating, Its Self, eternally, HERE-NOW.
>
> So that would be a **yes**.

No. That would be a, 'not necessarily so'.

See, once more, 'it' always depends on 'the observer', and 'their view and/or perspective' of things.

you are not yet, fully, seeing and understanding, exactly, what I am saying and meaning, here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> You’re claiming the universe to be infinite and eternal, all of everything, but it isn’t the future, yet. Or any of the other stuff yet created. It isn’t comprehensive.

But, it is comprehensive. And, you would already know this, if you had read, comprehended, and understood what I have already written, and meant, here.

But, because you are not seeking out nor wanting 'clarity', itself, here, you are just presuming what I am saying, and meaning, here. Which, by the way, quite a lot of it is Wrong, Inaccurate, and Incorrect.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > > It also allows conception of “internal creator” in which creator of the universe resides within the universe itself.
> >
> > Not necessarily so, because the Creator of the Universe, Itself, is the Universe, It Self
>
> And that’s circular.

It is not ina sense that 'circular' means or refers to an impossibility. See, when you understand and know how the Universe actually works, then that the Universe is what is creating It Self is 'circular'. Which is not a bad, negative, nor an impossible thing, at all.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> Something that is would not need create itself.

Are you under some sort of illusion that the Universe, Itself, was all created all at once, and nothing is changing and evolving?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> A does not create A. A is A.

So, what created and/or is creating the Universe, Itself, exactly?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 3:36 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 2:07 am
> > > With the terms and definitions provided one could point to a pineapple, or any other item, and easily declare existence. However one could not point to a pineapple and easily declare universe.
> >
> > If this is, really, what you want to believe, and say is true, then okay.
> >
> > But are you absolutely sure that one could not point to a pineapple, and then inform another, 'Therefore, or declare, Universe?
>
> You define universe as “all-there-is”. A pineapple is not “all-there-is”.

Do you define 'existence' as 'pineapple'?

If no, then a pineapple is also not 'existence'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> Pointing to a pineapple claiming it’s “all-there-is” is inaccurate.

How do you define 'existence'?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> Pointing to a pineapple claiming it’s “that which is perceived” is accurate.

And, 'that which is perceived' can only be perceived because of the Universe, Itself

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Apr 12, 2025 5:49 am
> Existence is the more comprehensive, more practical concept and term.

In relation to 'what', exactly?

Also, you keep missing the very obvious point, here.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 1:06 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:28 pm
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:41 pm
> > >
> > > Then to what are you referring?
> >
> > Direct experience.
>
> A unicorn is direct experience?
>
> So you refute your own claim?
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
> > Which points to that there isn’t anything beyond direct, immediate (so called) experience.
>
> That is blatant limitation, and you somewhat acknowledge that with your own statement.
>
> Existence is not confined to conscious or perceptive experience; that is only part of existence.
>
> What you refer to is existence, a part of existence if only conceptual. You already affirmed the unicorn by simply referencing it.
>
> You cannot definitively claim that unicorns do not materially exist. To do so you would have to be omniscient or omnipresent, and you don’t even know what’s going on next door.

If 'you' also come to understand and know the who, what, and how of 'omniscient' and 'omnipresent', then 'you' will also know and understand that it is possible to know that there is not a self breathing and blood pumping animal existing, which are called or known as 'unicorns'.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 3:24 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 1:06 am
> If 'you' also come to understand and know the who, what, and how of 'omniscient' and 'omnipresent', then 'you' will also know and understand that it is possible to know that there is not a self breathing and blood pumping animal existing, which are called or known as 'unicorns'.

The point does not concern the abilities of omniscience or omnipresence themselves.

The point is that particular individual does not possess the ability to make such a definitive declaration. Neither do you.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 3:33 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Mar 07, 2025 8:10 pm
>
> > **Phil8659** wrote: ↑ Fri Mar 07, 2025 1:47 pm
> > Draw this statement. You will find it impossible simply because you do not know what part of speech each is.
>
> There is no need to draw it. It is readily observed as expressed here:
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:34 am
> > This text is part of existence. Existence is the text. Existence flows as the text, as the background of the forum, as the background border, as the edge of the screen of the device. It continues as air, the breeze flowing through backyards, as towns, as cities, as continents, as oceans, as space, the solar system, the galaxy and beyond.
> >
> > All this, all that is existence. It’s observed. Felt. Heard. Thought. Perceived. Readily perceived. It’s all around and it’s all connected as illustrated above. It’s easily confirmed at this moment right where you are. One thing flows seamlessly into the next. It isn’t limited to the screen. It isn’t limited to the device. It isn’t limited to the town. Or the planet or the solar system. Existence is infinite.

Illustrated here: https://www.ilovephilosophy.com/t/exist ... e/81126/85

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 7:44 am

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:28 pm
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 07, 2025 4:41 pm
> > >
> > > Then to what are you referring?
> >
> > Direct experience.
>
> A unicorn is direct experience?
>
> So you refute your own claim?
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Sun Apr 13, 2025 8:54 am
> > Which points to that there isn’t anything beyond direct, immediate (so called) experience.
>
> That is blatant limitation, and you somewhat acknowledge that with your own statement.
>
> Existence is not confined to conscious or perceptive experience; that is only part of existence.
>
> What you refer to is existence, a part of existence if only conceptual. You already affirmed the unicorn by simply referencing it.
>
> You cannot definitively claim that unicorns do not materially exist. To do so you would have to be omniscient or omnipresent, and you don’t even know what’s going on next door.

Direct experience is not claimed, it’s a naturally arising sensed sense of presence, in this immediate pure beingness which is infinite empty nothingness (awareness) that is simultaneously infinitely everything. There’s nothing in direct experience to claim direct experience. Just as there’s nothing present in sleep or death to claim it’s sleeping or dead. Only thoughts create things, but thoughts are projected images that are already being observed, so what is being observed, cannot be what’s observing.What’s observing is direct experience, and there’s nothing outside or beyond this immediate experience.

Beingness can only experience direct pure empty beingness, and never what beingness is being. Meaning this empty looking sensed presence can only project an image of it’s own emptiness, therefore cannot be the image looked upon, it can only be what’s aware of an image, since the source of the image is emptiness beingness.

Direct experience doesn’t require a concept, or an image to exist. Concepts are simply mirages projected, they are simply images of the imageless.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 8:23 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 3:24 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 1:06 am
> > If 'you' also come to understand and know the who, what, and how of 'omniscient' and 'omnipresent', then 'you' will also know and understand that it is possible to know that there is not a self breathing and blood pumping animal existing, which are called or known as 'unicorns'.
>
> The point does not concern the abilities of omniscience or omnipresence themselves.

What?

It was 'you' who wrote and claimed;
'one would have to be omniscient or omnipresent, to be able to claim, definitely, that unicorns do not materially exist.

So, obviously 'a part of' 'the point' that you were making does concern 'the abilities' of 'omniscience' and 'omnipresence' themselves.

'I' was just informing 'you' that if 'you' also come to understand and know who and what is 'omniscient' and 'omnipresent', and how 'this One' is able to do 'these things', then 'you' will also know and understand that it is possible to know that there is not a self breathing and blood pumping animal, known as unicorns, existing.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 3:24 am
> The point is that particular individual does not possess the ability to make such a definitive declaration. Neither do you.

Once again, you have completely and utterly missed 'the point' I was 'pointing out' and 'making', here.

Again, if 'you' ever come to, also, know who and what, exactly, is 'omniscient' and 'omnipresent', then 'you' will, also, know that there is no self-sustaining living animal as what is called a 'unicorn'.

In other words, your claim, here, is also False, Wrong, Inaccurate, and Incorrect.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Mon Apr 14, 2025 8:24 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Once more, Existence, like Universe, is everywhere, all the time.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Martin Peter Clarke** » Fri Apr 18, 2025 11:38 am

Martin Peter Clarke
Posts: 1451
Joined: Tue Apr 01, 2025 9:54 pm

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 8:24 am
> Once more, Existence, like Universe, is everywhere, all the time.

Existence and Universe, whatever they are, may be, but everywhere there was, is and shall be, all the time there was, is and shall be, was, is and shall be existence. Of which our blip of a universe is an infinitesimal part.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Pistolero** » Fri Apr 18, 2025 12:46 pm

Pistolero
Posts: 703
Joined: Sat Apr 05, 2025 1:20 pm

Infinite signifies that which is unceasing, unending.... like dynamic existence.
Human brains reduce the dynamic to a state they can conceptualize - they reduce the dynamic to static wholes, like the concept of universe.
Consciousness does this by projecting itself in a noetic position "outside space/time", conceptualizing existence as a singularity.
this produces the paradox of multiplicities encompassed by a singularity.

If it remains within existence it can only conclude that there is no singularity....no absolute, only dynamic, interactive multiplicities - Energy.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Sat Apr 19, 2025 4:34 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Martin Peter Clarke** wrote: ↑ Fri Apr 18, 2025 11:38 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Apr 14, 2025 8:24 am
> > Once more, Existence, like Universe, is everywhere, all the time.
>
> Existence and Universe, whatever they are, may be, but everywhere there was, is and shall be, all the time there was, is and shall be, was, is and shall be existence. Of which our blip of a universe is an infinitesimal part.

What has some insignificant part of THE Universe, which you refer to as 'your blip', got to do with any thing, here?

Now,
'Universe', to some, means or refers to, **All-there-is; Everything; Totality.** So, that is what the word, 'Universe' is, exactly, here.

'Existence', to some, is the word used to refer to 'Being', (in this place), which is 'known' and that the 'I' in every human body is Aware of. So, that is what the word, 'Existence', is, exactly, here.

There is only One Universe and One Existence, which 'I' am Aware of. If 'you' know or are aware of any others, then will 'you' please inform 'us' of them?

Once more, this One and only Universe, which Exists, is infinite, spatially, and, eternal, temporally. And, again, this can not be refuted by any one.

And, if any one would like the irrefutable proof for this claim, then, as always, allow 'us' to just have a Truly open and honest discussion.

Post Reply 731 posts 1 … 37 38 **39** 40 41 … 49

‹ Return to “General Philosophical Discussion” Jump to

Philosophy Now magazine ‹ **Board index** Contact us Delete cookies All times are UTC+01:00

Powered by phpBB® Forum Software © phpBB Limited
Privacy | Terms